

A3072

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 15

In addition to this increased emphasis on our educational system, we must provide opportunity for those people now in the labor market who have not had the advantages of proper vocational training and we must also provide for those people who will not secure adequate training from high school either because of poor counseling or dropping from school prior to graduation. To do this the President has presented a program for youth opportunities. We in the Senate have passed the Youth Employment Opportunities bill which will provide more job training opportunities for young people. This program is designed for those young people who are in need of help * * * the unemployed * * * the unskilled * * * the unwanted. It is intended to boost the economy, reduce unemployment, reduce juvenile delinquency and train more young people who would otherwise be idle.

The Youth Conservation Corps will employ 15,000 young men in forest recreation areas. Federal funds will be provided for half the wages and related costs for young people employed on local projects offering useful working experience in nonprofit community services. This program is modest and it is essential. It is a cooperative, local-Federal approach. I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will act and act favorably on this program during the next few weeks.

In addition to those programs to train and retrain the youth of America, let us not overlook the program which has been initiated by the administration to rehabilitate those older workers who are presently unemployed because they do not possess the skills needed by space age industry. The manpower training program, although still in its infancy, is designed to take idle workers out of the unemployment line and return them to the production line. This is another effort presently being made under President Kennedy's leadership to provide a work force which is sufficiently skilled and trained to meet the challenge of the future.

We as Democrats, to be worthy of our tradition as a party of the people, must remain dedicated to these and other important programs which are essential not only to the strength of our great Nation but also to the future of each individual American.

Japan Furnishes Cuba With Five Fishing Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Communist Cuba has acquired from Japan five modern, long-range fishing trawler-type ships equipped with all technical equipment according to a news report.

Eighty Japanese technicians are reportedly in Cuba to teach the Cubans in the use of these boats. Ostensibly these vessels are to be used to develop a Cuban tuna industry.

In addition to the significance of the creation of a Cuban tuna fleet on the tuna industry generally, which requires cooperation among all interested parties as a means of preserving and developing tuna resources—something we can hardly expect from Castro—there are serious implications to the Cuban Govern-

ment acquiring modern, electronically equipped trawlers which can be used for many illicit purposes such as to perform espionage missions and related activities for the Communists. It is possible that this is the type of trawlers which were observed off Cape Canaveral attempting to gather information on our space launching today.

What action did the State Department take to attempt to prevent the furnishing of these vessels to Castro? What other examples along these lines are taking place even though we supposedly are making an effort to prevent the flow of goods of this nature to Cuba? The news report is based on a Havana radio broadcast. Does this mean that if our authorities had this information, it simply wasn't released?

The action by Japan in sending these ships to Cuba certainly runs counter to the interests and welfare of the United States. It calls for an intensification of our efforts to stem the flow of goods which will be used to build up Castro's ability to entrench his Communist government further and to arm Cuba for aggression and subversion in Latin America.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a news story on the shipment of Japanese vessels to Cuba by Mr. Charles Keeley of the Copley News Service:

WASHINGTON.—Japan has sent ships and technicians to Cuba to establish a tuna industry.

The State Department says it assumes the Cuban-Japanese agreement is probably to provide partial payment by the Japanese for Cuban sugar.

Japan is the free world's largest importer of Cuban sugar. It bought \$26,575,859 worth in 1961, according to Department of Commerce, and \$15 million during the first 6 months of 1962.

The agreement calls for 80 Japanese technicians and 5 modern, long-range ships, each with a 200-ton capacity, according to an official announcement by Havana radio.

Cuba has never had a tuna industry. Bonito, lobster, and shrimp are canned and exported, but tuna was imported from the United States.

The Japanese action appears contrary to U.S. efforts with its Western Allies to seal off Cuba economically. But the Commerce Department says Japan, in accordance with U.S. requests, is attempting to find other sources for its sugar needs.

The Japanese technicians will remain in Cuba for 1 year, according to the official Cuban announcement. Already, it adds, they have helped double Cuban fishing quotas. The 5 Japanese ships, each manned by 15 Japanese and 18 Cubans, brought in 1.5 million pounds of tuna and other fish during their first 30-day trip to sea, Cuban officials announced.

When the Japanese leave, they say, "Cuban youths * * * graduates of the fishing school Victoria de Giron * * * will take charge of the ships."

The announcement said the Japanese ships are equipped with the latest electronic gear and 50-mile trotlines. The tuna is packed in 9-ounce cans, while other fish will be sold, unprocessed, to the public, the Cubans said.

In 1962, Japan imported 431,482 metric tons of Cuban sugar, according to Commerce Department figures.

Cairo Maintains Buildup in Yemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment I recently proposed to sever American assistance to the nations like the United Arab Republic, which expend their own resources for the purchase of Soviet military equipment or engage in the proliferation of missile weapons systems, jeopardizing world peace, I wish to direct attention of the Congress to additional evidence of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's duplicity. I refer to an authoritative new report published in the New York Times and have requested permission for its insertion in the RECORD.

The Times report shows how Nasser reneged on an agreement worked out by the United States for a withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen and actually only rotating Egyptian units, thus betraying the United Nations which is seeking to bring about disengagement of the contending forces and deceiving the United States. This illustrates how appeasement of Nasser only encourages his attempts to subvert, infiltrate, and overthrow by aggression his neighboring states in his drive for power and domination.

This provides further evidence of the need to end subsidizing of this dictator who is no more trustworthy than Duvalier of Haiti or Castro of Cuba.

The New York Times article of May 15, 1963, follows:

CAIRO MAINTAINS BUILDUP IN YEMEN

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—United Arab Republic troops have been moved into as well as out of Yemen in the last 2 weeks despite Cairo's promise to reduce its involvement in Yemen's civil war.

Reports from the Middle East indicate that there has been a recent rotation of about 2,000 Egyptian soldiers in Yemen. Hardly any reduction of the total United Arab Republic force of 28,000 men has been effected. The Egyptians have been the main prop of the antimanagerial regime of President Abdullah al-Salal, who is under attack from royalist tribesmen.

Administration officials had no comment on the reports, although there were indications that they had similar information. They intend to continue to press President Gamal Abdel Nasser for compliance with the agreement worked out by the United States and turned over to the United Nations, but say that they have little power to alter the Yemen situation.

The disengagement accord was represented as a compromise to prevent a war over Yemen between the United Arab Republic and its principal Arab antagonist, Saudi Arabia. Officials have acknowledged that the agreement was merely a diplomatic ratification of a Saudi defeat in the dispute.

The agreement was worked out by Ellsworth Bunker, a retired U.S. diplomat, after 6 months of fighting in Yemen threatened to spread beyond the frontiers of the primitive nation on the Red Sea.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3071

in obtaining employment merit more serious consideration by public officials, civic leaders, and educational authorities.

A constructive and realistic approach to this problem is contained in an editorial in the Gallipolis Daily Tribune, April 18, 1963. The editor does not succumb to the temptation of placing all the blame for this problem on the parents and schools, but correctly points out that along with the parents, schools and industry, our youth have a responsibility to utilize their energy and resourcefulness to leave no stone unturned in their efforts to prepare themselves for useful employment.

The editorial follows:

A THOUGHT ABOUT YOUTH

There is a growing hue and cry throughout the country concerning the terrific increase in the number of youth in our country that are unemployed. It should also be the concern of the residents of Gallia County. We predict that it will get much worse before it gets better because it is going to take special attention and the retooling of much of our educational program to bring about the change. In an area like our own the school systems are hard pressed to even keep up with the minimum standards of education as set by the State. In a country not too far away they are about to close down some substandard high schools that cannot meet those standards. How can we expect a fringe area to do much more than the minimum, and in some instances they cannot even mount the minimum.

There is the charge that American education is turning millions of young people into unemployables because the jobs that they are being trained for, jobs that are in a diminishing, and in some instances, vanishing supply. There are some that say it is even a national scandal. In some respects we feel that the statements are a little out of line when they say that 80 percent of the youth are being ignored, and the reference is to that group who do not go to college. We find that there are even many people coming out of college who are not prepared for the situation that faces them. Many students are getting their degree and then find that they have to go on to graduate school to prepare for something specific. That is a story that is as old as the hills. Its only solution is in the constant guidance of youth into fields of interest that they are fitted for and will take into account the constant changes that are taking place in the job opportunities in the future.

There are some Government planners that say that there is no unemployment problem which could not be cured by a rise in the economic growth of our country. There is some truth in that statement but such growth is not always spread evenly and what might help persons in one part of the country would not filter through to those where it is most needed. Recently we were staggered by a report coming out of a neighboring State where over \$100,000 was spent by the Government to train painters and welders for jobs in a plant with a big Government contract. Maybe we are all wrong but there has always been an opportunity to learn such trades in specialized schools and in the normal labor channels. The total blame should not be placed on the schools. A young person who wants to be assured of a job could no doubt approach many craftsmen and certain concerns right here in Gallia County and gain part-time experience that would be good insurance against unemployment. Often too is the overlooked fact that the basic things learned in school, while seemingly impractical are essential tools. The ability to read a set of instructions and understand them.

Challenges of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH, addressed the annual convention of the California Federation of Young Democrats in San Francisco. His remarks indicate a clear insight to the challenges of the future, and are so noteworthy I recommend them to my colleagues:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR BIRCH BAYH, OF INDIANA, AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS, SAN FRANCISCO, MAY 4, 1963

I am happy to have been invited to join you tonight at this annual convention of the California Young Democrats. I am proud to be a young Democrat and prouder still of the work our organization is doing in support of the programs of the Democratic Party and of the administration of John F. Kennedy. The work of the Young Democrats in the State of Indiana during the past year contributed greatly to the success we had at the polls last fall and in my election to the U.S. Senate. We can be proud and we can be thankful that the Democratic Party has always looked to the young people in our party and asked them to join in the programs of progress for the country. I believe the reason our party has become the oldest political party in the world is the fact that it has had the courage and the wisdom to look to its younger members for new ideas, new ways of solving the problems of each day.

In his inaugural address in 1961, President Kennedy accepted for our generation the torch of freedom and pledged that we would carry it proudly, successfully in the challenging days that lie ahead. In the days which have followed that ceremony he has certainly carried the torch high and led our country and the free world well. He needs our support, he needs the support of all the people in this Nation in order to bring the progress that is needed to keep America strong and free and to develop a world in which freedom can flourish.

As a nation we are moving into a period of unprecedented challenge and one of unprecedented opportunity. We, as younger people, must share the challenge just as we will benefit from the opportunities which will be provided.

The challenge is simple to define. We are faced simply with the problem of providing the benefits of our prosperous society and our way of life for the ever-increasing numbers of citizens in America. We must do this in a time when science and technology is rapidly displacing the need for human skills and human energy. Those most severely affected by this problem are the young people and we as young people must do our part in providing the answers and solutions which will be necessary.

Before the end of this decade we will become a country of more than 200 million inhabitants, and by the end of the century we will be a country of nearly 300 million inhabitants. We must provide the homes, schools, and most importantly the jobs to keep pace with this dynamic growth in population. The statistics of growth are staggering. During the next 8 years 26 million new young workers will come into the labor market. At the same time, machines are replacing people at a fantastic rate. To provide

employment for both new and displaced workers and to solve the unemployment problems by 1970, we must create 250,000 new jobs each month during this period.

The need for unskilled labor has reached a minimum level and we cannot expect any rise in this demand in the future. Additional skills and training will be needed by anyone who seeks employment. Yet during the decade ahead, we can expect that 3 out of every 10 school children will not finish high school. Only 2 out of 10 now in grade school will finish college. Employment projections on the other hand indicate that the best job opportunities will occur in professional and technical areas that require post-high-school training.

In education we must seek to improve the quality of instruction—cope with the tremendous problem of additional numbers of children coming into the schools in the future. We must increase the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop talents, complete their education, and continue self-development through life.

The quality of education is determined primarily by the quality of the teacher. We are fortunate in having thousands of well-trained and dedicated teachers in this country today. Yet out of every five teachers in the United States has either not been certified by the State as qualified to teach or has failed to complete 4 years of college study. In the field of English, between 40 and 60 percent of the secondary school teachers lack the minimum requirement of a college major in that subject. Thus it is not surprising that, largely because of unsatisfactory elementary and secondary school instruction, our colleges and universities are now required to devote a great amount of their resources on remedial English courses.

Good teachers, moreover, need good schools in which to teach. Last year over 1,500,000 children were in overcrowded classrooms and an estimated 2 million others were studying amid grossly substandard health and safety conditions.

In many areas the education of the economically disadvantaged, the culturally deprived, the physically or mentally handicapped and the gifted required specially designed programs which simply are not available at all.

The value of a proper education cannot be overstated. President Kennedy summarized distinctly the value of education in his message to Congress on education earlier this year. Education, he said, is the key-stone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education coupled with the widespread availability of college education.

In order to maintain the arch of freedom, we must be prepared today to move forward to more aggressive programs of education. The President has presented a comprehensive national education program.

This is not a Federal thought control program. It is rather a program designed to enable the U.S. Government to assist State and local school units to meet the serious problem which is of great national interest. State and local school units will still control their own programs. However, more overall resources will be utilized in the vital area of education.

During my tenure in the State legislature, I did everything I could to increase the emphasis on education in the State of Indiana. Yet we were almost universally opposed by those Republicans who would pinch pennies and sacrifice a first-class educational system. If State governments and local communities will not meet the needs of educating their young, then we must move forward and move forward rapidly to provide the type of comprehensive educational program presented by the President.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 15

So Mr. MANSFIELD's motion to lay Mr. COTTON's amendment on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was laid on the table be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I propose to submit an amendment; but I wish to state that it is my understanding that an order will be obtained—if it has not already been obtained—to have the Senate convene at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I believe I have already made that request and have been granted that consent; namely, to have the Senate take a recess from tonight until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an order has already been entered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that after I lay down the amendment, it will be the last business for today in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk; but I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be withheld until the Senate convenes tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the time taken in today's session from now until the recess is taken, later this evening, be considered apart from the limitation agreed to on yesterday in regard to amendments to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Cuba
"DOCTRINE OF INTERNATIONAL ONEDOWNMANSHIP" — ADDRESS BY SENATOR BENNETT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as one possessed of a high degree of clarity, commonsense, and long-range vision, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is second to none in this body. Whenever he prepares remarks or a speech or whenever he announces his position on any subject, he does so as the result of careful analysis and preparation.

Earlier this week he spoke to a group in Joplin, Mo., on the subject of "an apparent inability to hold our own with Khrushchev and the Communists, marked by our aimless drifting into ever weaker positions"; and he referred to Cuba as "the current and compelling symbol of our growing fears" in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the speech delivered by Senator BENNETT on May 13 to the Joplin Chamber of Commerce. The speech is entitled "Doctrine of International Onedownmanship."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTRINE OF INTERNATIONAL ONEDOWNMANSHIP

(Speech by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, Joplin, Mo., Chamber of Commerce, Monday, May 13, 1963.)

Today there are two great, overriding problems which worry the American people. One is more directly related to the personal problems faced by members of the chamber of commerce. It involves the administration's evident determination to impose more and more controls over business by means of programs that ignore tried economic principles and astronomical costs. The current symbols of these policies are the tax proposals and the mounting deficits.

The other problem is beginning to disturb—even to frighten—all of us, and it grows out of an apparent inability to hold our own with Khrushchev and the Communists, marked by our aimless drifting into ever weaker positions. The current and compelling symbol of our growing fears is Castro's Cuba.

As a Senator with a business background, you may be expecting me to talk about the first subject—fiscal irresponsibility. But I think the second is the most immediate danger—for chamber of commerce members as well as their customers. So, with your indulgence, I shall talk about the Cuban problem.

Every day in every way we are told that Cuba is not really a problem—that it is unseemly for the powerful United States to show such terror over a tinhorn dictator on an economically collapsing island. We are told that this makes us look foolish in the eyes of the world. This point of view is being given increasing currency by the news managers of the State Department and the Pentagon, by the curious lot of amateur geopoliticians at the White House, and by the publicists and pundits of the present administration.

That their arguments are bad history, bad logic, and worse military policy has not penetrated the minds of those who make them. That the American people do not accept this twisted view of the Cuban problem has failed to reach the New Frontier mentality.

Cuba is small, but so was the thorn in the lion's paw which Androcles removed with impunity. More important, these counsels of tolerance are beside the point.

In the present struggle between communism and freedom, between the organized death of totalitarian slavery and the unlimited horizons of an open society, Cuba is far more than a piece of real estate 90 miles off the coast of Florida or the base of Red subversion in the Americas. Cuba is at once the symbol of the great cold war confrontation and an index of what the future may hold for America. And it is in these terms that it must be considered.

It is commonplace today to condemn President Kennedy for the failure of his Cuban policy. The public debate rages over mistakes he has made and weaknesses he has shown in his dealing with Nikita Khrushchev and the Kremlin. One major point, however, emerges above the errors of omission and commission. Without so much as consulting his peers in Congress or the American people who elected him, Mr. Kennedy has quietly scrapped both traditional American

foreign policy based on the Monroe Doctrine, and the more recently constructed inter-American security system. He has substituted for them a Kennedy doctrine based on premises hitherto considered both alien and false.

Everything he has done since taking office follows inevitably from this new doctrine. What we consider mistakes, bad judgment, or faulty reasoning are, in fact, entirely consistent with the Kennedy doctrine of international onedownmanship. For the President not to have canceled the air cover in the critical hours of the Bay of Pigs invasion would have contradicted the Kennedy doctrine. To have publicly recognized the Soviet arms buildup at a time when our intelligence agencies were reporting it to the National Security Council would again have been inconsistent with the doctrine. To have pressed the advantage he gained by imposing his selective quarantine would have run directly counter to the thinking of the administration.

What has confused the pundits and brought embarrassment to the New Frontier has been the lack of consonance between the Kennedy doctrine and the utterances of administration spokesmen, from the President down. Until fairly recently, the words of the Kennedy administration came from the book of established and recognized American policy. No one could quarrel with those words, for they were based on the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Treaty which set up a mechanism for action of the Organization of American States, and the practical traditions which impelled this country to spur the overthrow of a Communist-controlled regime in Guatemala. What the Kennedy administration has done, however, is something else again.

In short, there has been an "honesty gap" in our foreign policy since 1961—almost as if Mr. Kennedy and his advisers felt that the American people could not be trusted with the truth or told in plain language what the administration was seeking to achieve—and how and why. It is obvious that this lack of frankness was motivated by a well-founded suspicion that any confession of new purpose, any explanation of the Kennedy doctrine, would have had immediate repercussions politically harmful to the administration and to the party which it claims to represent.

The Kennedy doctrine—and it applies to the disengagement from Laos as well as to the Cuban problem—is based on a series of assumptions, mistaken and dangerous, as to the nature of the Communist system and the meaning of the Khrushchev hegemony. I say "mistaken" because neither experience nor scholarly analysis will sustain them. I say "dangerous" because they can lead to the destruction of this Republic and the ultimate victory of communism.

What are those assumptions? Some are general, some are specific. In the general category, the most prevalent assumption is the fond hope, expressed frequently by State Department policy planner Walt Rostow, that the Kremlin and its leaders are "maturing." So far, the only evidence of that maturity has been found in the speculations of journalistic "experts" who got the idea from Mr. Rostow in the first place. The major premise on which the Kennedy doctrine stands is therefore a product of tail-in-mouth reasoning. Khrushchev has been shrewder in his dealings with the free world than Stalin was. To be sure, he has been bound by certain consequences of the interregnum following Stalin's death—the let-up in pressure on the Russian people, the recognition of the need for consumer goods, and the demands of a bankrupting space program. Beyond this, however, the mixture is as before. The rape of Budapest and the

1963

Europe. The President has had serious problems to meet. He knows that something should be done. He is still working on this problem. I can report to the Senate, especially to the Senators who are interested in the woolen problem, that we are very hopeful that something will take place and that something will be done. However, what is suggested here is not the way to do it.

What we are trying to do tonight is not to rock the boat. What the Senator from Rhode Island asked the Senator from New Hampshire was: If he believed so much in this cause that he is defending tonight, and if he won the whole point, would he vote finally for the passage of the bill? The Senator from New Hampshire said that he would not. So what is the cause he is fighting for? Are we not swinging an empty bag? If we want results, let us go out and get results.

All I am saying is that I agree with the substance of the amendment; I agree with the spirit of the amendment. But we know very well that the amendment will not carry tonight. It just will not "wash" tonight. So we will have accomplished nothing. If we want results, this is not the way to get them.

That is why I say it is untimely to bring up this amendment. It will prove nothing, it will do nothing, and it will hurt the cause of the textile industry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, of all the amendments that have been acted upon today, will this be the only one to be dealt with by a motion to table?

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is the only one.

Mr. COTTON. I regret that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] that hearings will be started on cotton on May 20. A subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is prepared to undertake a thorough and complete study.

We have been told that there is no place for an amendment of this sort on the feed grain bill which is now before the Senate.

We have been further assured that Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, has indicated that at about the same time the Senate committee starts its hearing, his committee also will start hearings. So I think we have just about as much in the way of assurances that we can have on the floor of the Senate.

Therefore, I must say to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], with deep regret, that I now move to table his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on the motion to table, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—44

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Anderson | Gruening | McGovern |
| Bartlett | Hart | McIntyre |
| Bayh | Hartke | McNamara |
| Bible | Hayden | Metcalf |
| Brewster | Humphrey | Monroney |
| Burdick | Inouye | Nelson |
| Cannon | Jackson | Neuberger |
| Church | Javits | Pastore |
| Clark | Johnston | Pell |
| Cooper | Long, Mo. | Proxmire |
| Dodd | Long, La. | Ribicoff |
| Edmondson | Magnuson | Robertson |
| Ellender | Mansfield | Symington |
| Engle | McClellan | Young, N. Dak. |
| Fulbright | McGee | |

NAYS—36

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Aiken | Gore | Mundt |
| Beall | Hickenlooper | Pearson |
| Bennett | Hill | Prouty |
| Boggs | Holland | Randolph |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hruska | Scott |
| Carlson | Jordan, N.C. | Simpson |
| Cotton | Jordan, Idaho | Smith |
| Curtis | Keating | Sparkman |
| Dirksen | Kuchel | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lausche | Talmadge |
| Ervin | Mechem | Thurmond |
| Fong | Miller | Young, Ohio |

NOT VOTING—20

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------------|
| Allott | Kennedy | Saltonstall |
| Byrd, Va. | McCarthy | Smathers |
| Case | Morse | Tower |
| Dominick | Morton | Williams, N.J. |
| Douglas | Moss | Williams, Del. |
| Goldwater | Muskie | Yarborough |
| Kefauver | Russell | |

nuclear arming of Cuba are hardly examples of the maturity we are told has begun to blossom in the Kremlin.

The world has forgotten the jubilant predictions after Yalta and Potsdam that "good old Joe" Stalin was breaking away from his Marxist-Leninist puberty and accepting the responsibilities of mature international statesmanship. Averell Harriman, the present architect of the Lao mess, returned in 1944 from a tour of duty in Moscow and informed the press that Stalin was ready, anxious, and able to cooperate with the free nations in building a peaceful postwar world. Even after the cold war had frostbitten the hopes of many, Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., reassured a "Town Hall Meeting of the Air" that if Stalin seemed uncompromising it was because he had to justify his actions to "the Colonel McCormicks" of the Soviet press.

Behind the Kennedy doctrine is the belief that Khrushchev stands like Horatio at the bridge holding back the missile-rattling hot-heads of the Kremlin and a jingoist Red army, navy, and air force. It is said, ad infinitum and ad nauseam, that if we allow Khrushchev to fall, he will be replaced by the bloodthirsty extremists of the Kremlin—men long of tooth and short of intelligence who hate Khrushchev's liberalism and are hardly better than a Russian version of the John Birch Society.

This fundamental precept of the Kennedy doctrine was prominently operative through the suddenly acknowledged Cuban crisis of last autumn. The White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon leaked like gushers to the newspapers horrendous tales of a struggle within the Kremlin in which Khrushchev fought for moderation and the extremists and military leaders called for long risks and the kind of adventurism which can lead to war. There was considerable drama in these stories, but no solid evidence to give them substance. There were no signs that the Soviet Army was pressing Comrade Khrushchev to take a chance on nuclear war. Nor, for that matter, were the so-called extremists—if only because most of them are figments of the State Department's imagination.

The Soviet military wants no incidents which can escalate into nuclear war. Soviet military doctrine calls for caution until the United States has been outdistanced in nuclear weapons and the systems to deliver them. What happened last year with respect to Cuba is that the Soviet military reluctantly went along with Khrushchev, just as Hitler's generals accepted the order to invade Russia which they knew meant defeat. It is now clear what many of them felt then, that the decision to build up a Soviet nuclear missile base in Cuba was Khrushchev's, that he laid the groundwork for it in speeches and boasts and Pravda editorials.

This false theory of a maturing communism is, however, but a part of the Kennedy doctrine. If it is accepted, it justifies the corollary belief that to seek victory over the enemies of freedom is somehow evil—or worse still, foolish. It is the Kennedy position that total victory is not only illusory but in itself bad. The United States must never indulge itself in moral or categorical imperatives. Everything must be subject to negotiation. In this manner, the Kennedy doctrinaires argue, we will wheedle the Devil out of Hell and coax back into Pandora's box the hornets which escaped. Thus we will "defuse" Laos, Berlin, and, yes, Cuba. To call for victory, we are warned, is also to call for total war—a statement we hear from the administration with great unctious. Logic, of course, does too prevail here; but since when has logic been a prerequisite for political debate on the New Frontier?

The simple thrust of this argument is this: That the American people must cease to think in terms of any victory, must resign themselves to the existence of the Communist cancer. History moves, however, that communism cannot be contained. It must either be slowly and inexorably defeated or, by its dynamism, it will defeat us. In war, in politics, and in diplomacy, there is no substitute for victory. Whoever says otherwise is dangerously mistaken.

But if we realize that the administration sincerely believes these two propositions, that (1) communism and Khrushchev are maturing, and (2) that to seek victory in the cold war means igniting a hot war, then the entire Kennedy doctrine and the President's Cuban policy suddenly become clear. It explains why Mr. Kennedy called off the air support at the Bay of Pigs 2 years ago; why he waited as long as he did last year to declare a quarantine; and why today he is at war with those Cubans whose only wish is to liberate their country and return to their homes. It also explains why some around the President, notably Ambassador Stevenson, wish to abdicate the prerogatives of American policy and turn the whole matter over to a United Nations dominated by a proliferating band of countries which lack both the experience and the desire to find answers for the problems of Communist subversion and revolution.

So much for generalities. Now for the specifics.

Fidel Castro was just one more unwashed guerrilla until the men in the State Department's middle echelon—a group that remains in office however the Government may change—gave him its blessing. It was through their intercession that Castro became a prominent figure whose pictures and words covered the front pages of the American press. The record is absolutely clear that those who saw Fidel Castro as a Latin American Robin Hood ignored or downgraded the many intelligence reports then available concerning his Communist associations and influence.

This mistaken assessment of Castro was a serious error on the part of the Eisenhower administration. But it was one which that President was attempting to rectify at the time he left office. Diplomatic relations had been broken off with the Castro-Communist regime. The Cuban sugar quota, the mainstay of its economy, had been canceled. An invasion of the island by U.S.-trained Cubans, with logistical and air support from American military forces, was being planned. It seemed certain, then, that Castro's days were numbered.

But the changing of the guard at the White House changed the policies. The invasion, which could have toppled Khrushchev's command post in the Western Hemisphere, was handled like a 50-mile hike along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal—and with just about as much security. Before the Cuban freedom fighters landed, Castro's forces knew exactly where and when to expect them. Nevertheless, in spite of this, with adequate air cover, the exiles could have established a beachhead. But the United Nations group within the administration panicked and persuaded the President to torpedo the landings at the Bay of Pigs. They were afraid success here might disturb the other American Republics, tarnish our image in Europe, and encourage the Kremlin to direct adventures of its own in Latin America. The moment that the air cover was withdrawn, the Kennedy doctrine was born. From that point on, the administration spoke loudly but carried no stick at all.

It is clear that as another aftermath of the Bay of Pigs, the Kremlin decided that the United States was too liberal, too cow-

ardly, and too confused to fight. Then the arms buildup began in earnest. Not only medium and intermediate range missiles and their launchers were shipped into Cuba by the Soviet Union, but tremendous stocks of conventional arms and munitions accompanied them. Throughout the summer of 1962, the National Security Council was bombarded with reports of these arms shipments. Precise, though circumstantial, evidence of a nuclear missile buildup began reaching Washington.

We know, for example, that very early in the summer of 1962, the Soviet Union ceased to make its shipments to Cuba in Western European or Latin American bottoms. Soviet vessels with specially constructed holds began to put into Cuban harbors—unloading at night under conditions of maximum security. Every scrap of intelligence pointed unmistakably to the buildup in Cuba. The President must have known as well as anyone can know what goes on in a police state, that Cuba was being converted into a giant Soviet launching pad.

Early in September, the President discussed this situation with congressional leaders of both parties. And at that time, he conceded freely that there was evidence that the Soviets were constructing missile launching pads in Cuba. It violates no confidences to repeat this. At the time, there was a bipartisan leak of this information, though publicly, administration spokesmen continued to charge those who spoke up with being warmongers and irresponsible ones at that. These attacks on those who knew the facts and wanted the President to act on them, continued until hours before Mr. Kennedy's October 22 speech in which he declared his blockade. This utter disregard of the danger potential of a nuclear-armed Cuba raises one very interesting question:

Would the President have acted had not the Joint Chiefs of Staff demanded action as strenuously as they were able, and had not the American public demonstrated its concern? In an election year, it is difficult to tell where political considerations end and statesmanship begins. In a very real sense, this distinction is unimportant. When the history books are written and when a nation cashes in its chips, it's what's up front that counts, not the rationalizations of those who make policy. Louis XVI was a well-intentioned man, but those intentions paved his way to the guillotine and invited the terror.

By declaring his blockade, Mr. Kennedy thoroughly shocked the Kremlin. The military in the Soviet Union could say "I told you so" to Khrushchev, and it did. He attempted to bluff his way out of his untenable position and was met by firmness from the White House. And then, while the plaudits of his peers for his boldness were still ringing in his ears, President Kennedy reverted once more to his doctrine. In order not to deliver Nikita to the mythical Kremlin extremists, he began to compromise. The debacle in Moscow that might have resulted from a strong policy was averted, and Khrushchev smiled again. For—let us face it—the blockade of October 22 was followed by a more abject series of American retreats and compromises than this country has ever seen before. In rapid succession, the President took the following steps which amazed most Americans, but which take on clear meaning in light of the Kennedy doctrine:

1. He agreed to prevent any invasion of Cuba from American soil.
2. He engaged to prevent U.S. allies in the Organization of American States from aiding, abetting, or even permitting any invasion attempts from their soil—thereby making of Cuba a privileged sanctuary for communism.

3. He announced, through his subordinates, the dismantling of U.S. IRBM bases in Turkey and Italy—something which Khrushchev had demanded as the price of his withdrawal of missiles from Cuba.

4. He lost all interest in the on-site inspection of Soviet missile sites in Cuba—originally a condition for calling off the blockade.

5. He left the British high and dry by shooting down the Skybolt program which would have given Great Britain and the Commonwealth its own deterrent to Soviet missile roulette.

6. He declared war on the Cuban exiles, placing their leaders under what amounted to house arrest in Miami.

7. He unleashed his news managers who once more began be-roguing those who warned of the Cuban threat as "warmongers" and "war whoopers."

8. He broadly hinted that any overthrow of the Castro regime would have to come from within Cuba—but without any American aid. In short, he told the freedom fighters both here and on the tragic little island: "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water."

9. He instructed U.S. naval units, which had been deployed to contain Castro communism, to train their guns on Cuban exiles who attempted to mount raids against their homeland from non-U.S. bases.

10. He dissuaded concerned allies in the Organization of American States from taking strong positions on Cuba.

This tenfold withdrawal has not been matched by a corresponding withdrawal of Soviet forces in Cuba. The President allows that there are some 12,000 or 13,000 Soviet troops occupying the island and keeping Comrade Castro ideologically pure. Other sources insist that there are as many as 40,000 Soviet effectives in Cuba, plus military cadres from other Communist nations, including China.

Secretary of State Rusk has expressed official distress at the continued presence of these troops and has pledged the United States to take steps if they are used to suppress an anti-Castro revolt. But these are games. The Soviet Union does not need to throw its troops into battle. The mere presence of these Soviet troops will prevent an uprising. And even without the Kremlin's muscle, the likelihood of a revolt is very slim indeed without firm U.S. support. In our times, no guerrilla movement can succeed against a police state unless it is trained, armed, and subsidized by a major power, and unless it has a sanctuary where it can regroup and be resupplied. The President has asked the Cubans to mount a do-it-yourself revolt, but so far he has failed to offer the kind of help which only could give such an adventure hope of success. To the American people he has counseled patience—the kind of patience which will be willing to wait for communism's maturity and for tigers who change their spots.

In his rhetorical battle with critics of his Cuban policy or lack thereof, Mr. Kennedy complains that they offer plenty of carping criticism but no alternatives, forgetting that it is he as President that has access to all the information, as well as the constitutional responsibility to develop and execute our foreign policy. The President asserts that unless we are prepared to face a nuclear holocaust, his doctrine of "no win" and patience is the only course left open to the American people and their Government. If the President is correct in this, then certainly we critics have no right to talk about Cuba. But is the choice only between two alternatives, drift and destruction? Is it a case of better Red than dead? Are there no other alternatives to our present course on Cuba? Before answering these questions,

let me compare our strengths and weaknesses to those of the Soviet Union. By doing this, I believe we can arrive at some sound conclusion—and it is from these rather than from fear or from neat theories that American policy can and must be made.

The first conclusion is that while the Soviet Union has repeatedly threatened nuclear war if the United States took one more step, Khrushchev's legions in the past have always marched down the hill even more rapidly than they marched up when faced with firmness. Even the short-lived blockade proved this.

The second conclusion is that the United States holds an undisputed lead in nuclear weaponry and delivery systems. At the present time, we could wipe the Soviet Union off the map if we were forced to resort to general war.

The third conclusion is that the Communists do not fight wars simply because they like the sound of gunfire. They fight to win, and their generals have acknowledged that as of now the Soviet Union is in no position to wage a major war.

The fourth conclusion is that the Soviet military has studied the textbooks and knows where wars can be fought and how. Conflict over Cuba would have the Communists fighting in the wrong place at the wrong time. Being practical men, they would prefer to cut their losses on the theory that "he who fights and runs away will live to fight another day."

These four conclusions—or more accurately, these four bases for a sound policy—would, I am certain, be supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As military men they know the miseries of war far better than the "whiz kids" who have the President's ears. The Joint Chiefs were aware of these conclusions when they strongly advised the President to order a quick air strike on the missile sites in Cuba. They were ignored by those whose policies are founded on the premise that if we do not irritate the Khrushchevian bull, he will change his name from Nikita to Ferdinand.

The consequence of this confusion is that we have no real policy on Cuba today because those charged with formulating one are paralyzed by a fear (which exists only in their minds) of a Khrushchev bent on launching his missiles against us. If we had a sound policy, a "command decision" as Vice President Nixon recently called for, you can be sure that I and my associates in the loyal opposition would be in the vanguard of the supporters of the President. For we want a bipartisan policy on Cuba—one that takes into account the vital security interests of the United States and its allies. If such a policy exists, it is obscured from our vision as well as yours.

Are there alternatives? There are many that could be considered in our quest for the means by which the Communists can be dislodged from this hemisphere. They include, for example, the following:

1. A pacific blockade to sever the lifeline between the Soviet Union and Cuba. We are told that this would be an act of war. We were not told that by the President on October 22. This, however, is a lawyer's debate. Short of the invasion of one country by another, the only act of war is one which can be resisted by the antagonist. And, as I have noted, the Soviet Union is in no position—logistically or otherwise—to effectively resist an American blockade. In point of fact, legality is on our side. Under the various international agreements and charters to which the United States is a party, the overriding principle of self-defense is recognized as acceptable, and, clearly, the security of this hemisphere is in jeopardy.

2. Cuban exiles throughout the Americas might be permitted to form a government of their own which could be immediately

recognized by the American States and supplied with adequate assistance and material to train and equip forces for action against Castro's island stronghold.

3. The United States could suspend negotiations with all Communist powers on all diplomatic questions presently pending until it is satisfied that the Soviet military presence in Cuba is terminated.

4. Though the United States has stated that it would not sit by if Soviet troops were used to crush an internal Cuban rebellion, the declaration could be made positively. By that I mean that the President could state unequivocally that use of Soviet troops against Cuban nationals would immediately trigger the signal for U.S. armed intervention. I believe we could go further and add an ultimatum date for the withdrawal from Cuba of all Communist military forces.

Through the plentiful radio facilities that are available on American soil and in the Caribbean region, the United States could beam a steady stream of broadcasts in Russian to Soviet troops in Cuba, offering them asylum in the United States. Just as during the Korean war we offered large rewards to Communist pilots fleeing with their Mig jets, so could we make a similar offer again. A half-dozen defections would do more to convince Khrushchev that he must withdraw his troops from Cuba than all the diplomatic exchanges in the world.

I mention these examples to show that there are other options besides the present drift and the threat of destruction. My purpose is to suggest the need for a firm decision that communism must go from this hemisphere and that we must adopt a policy to hasten its departure.

Determination is America's most potent weapon. But it is the weapon which the Kennedy administration seems most reluctant to use. Half-measures and qualified phrases do not impress the Kremlin. Khrushchev retreated last October because he realized that the Americans were aroused and ready to move, that whatever President Kennedy's motives may have been he had no other recourse but the temporarily tough line that he took. The Kremlin ceased to retreat and began its encroachments once more as soon as it realized that the President was willing—yes, eager—to accept the thought for the deed.

Cuba is a military threat to the Western Hemisphere. But, as I said at the outset, it has also become a symbol to all the world of American ineptitude, timidity, uncertainty. It is the gauntlet which Comrade Khrushchev has thrown down and which we have not really dared to throw back at him. It is convincing evidence that the most powerful Nation on earth can be intimidated, lied to, and laughed at with impunity by the Communists—and perhaps anyone else.

The lesson of Cuba remains today what it was last September, when a prominent young Cuban intellectual, who had originally supported Castro, penned these ominous words: "Of all the lessons Fidel Castro has taught us, the bitterest and most obvious is this: He who proclaims himself a Communist can count on help from the Soviet Union even though he is 9,000 miles from its borders, while he who proclaims himself a democrat can fight and die 90 miles from the shores of the United States and no one will come to his aid."

We greatly need a bold new policy which will demonstrate the falsity of that notion.

"TEN NEGROES"—ARTICLES BY ROBERT S. BIRD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there have been appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, in a succession of issues, an extraordinary series of articles, under

Strength Through Stockpiling Strategic Minerals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement entitled "Strength Through Stockpiling Strategic Minerals," prepared by Charles Will Wright, former Chief of the Mining Division of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and presently a consulting engineer. The statement deals with a most important topic, and deserves the attention of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STRATEGIC MINERAL STRENGTH THROUGH STOCKPILING FOREWORD

The importance of minerals—the basis of industrial power—is not sufficiently realized and not much is being done in regard to the seriousness of the situation. Today we are living among nations with diversified goals, individual and national, for specific objectives, such as putting a man on the Moon, and dominating the whole world—which is Khrushchev's visionary objective.

All goals require a great amount of planning, resources, and cooperation. To maintain freedom we, and our allies, must start working more as a team to build up combined industrial, moral, and military power to conquer communism, mankind's cruellest enemy.

Both our industrial and political power lie in our ability to produce and acquire raw mineral products. Elmer W. Fehrson in "Survival Through Mineral Strength" published in the November issue of Mining Engineering attacks publicity against stockpiling and urges recognition of stockpiling as an essential part of our preparedness. But our stockpile surpluses are being questioned and legislative changes are being prepared to dispose of a \$3.4 billion Federal stockpile of strategic minerals from aluminum to zirconium that are considered surplus to defense needs. Shouldn't we consider our industrial needs and the probability that certain of these minerals now in the stockpile may not be available from abroad a few years hence and then only at higher prices? It is better to err on the side of a safe abundance than risk an unpredicted shortage. In an emergency such as the Korean war, when certain metals were in short supply, the cost of acquiring them was greatly increased.

In contrast to stockpiling grain, amounting to \$3.8 billion in value and costing our taxpayers a million dollars a day, or 10 percent a year, the cost of stockpiling strategic minerals which do not deteriorate, and valued at about \$8 billion was \$12.5 million a year or one-fifth of 1 percent.

DANGERS AHEAD

We may not have a third world war of the shooting kind, but an aggressive economic trade war is in progress and we are in danger of being cut off from foreign sources of metals essential to our industrial progress. The probability that certain metals, in which we are deficient, may not be available from such sources at the end of this decade is a real danger. At the present time nationalization of foreign industries is

depriving us of supply sources. We are in danger of losing our main source of cobalt if the Communists take over Katanga; and of tin, for which we depend entirely on imports, by incursions into southeast Asia of the Red Chinese. As tin production in the Western Hemisphere amounts to less than 7 percent of the world's output, the decision to sell U.S. stocks of tin and other strategic minerals and metals is most unwise. Such procedure will adversely affect employment, commodity prices, development of new resources and relations with other producing nations.

Russia, Red China, Germany, and Japan are carrying out plans to meet their industrial requirements for metals by encouraging development of domestic ore deposits and increasing imports by barter trade agreements with mineral producing companies abroad. They are thus depriving us of certain sources we have depended upon and are strengthening their mineral position. Our Government should do more to encourage our mining companies, by way of taxation, depletion, and depreciation allowances and protection against confiscation without just compensation.

OUR STOCKPILES

We have stockpiles of silver ingots which may soon be insufficient to back up our paper dollars. We also have stockpiles of copper, lead, and zinc which should be increased. Thirty years ago we had a surplus of these metals for export. In 1962 to meet industry's demands our imports of copper amounted to 470,000 tons, or 30 percent of our requirement; of lead 409,000 tons or 38 percent, and of zinc 470,000 tons or 47 percent. As our self-sufficiency in these metals will be much less in 1970, isn't it time to start importing larger tonnages of these and the other metals we will need, while they are still available?

We are the world's largest consumer of nonferrous metals and we are gradually being deprived of certain traditional sources abroad. And there is a growing desire among free nations to be independent of imports and where possible, to produce the metals locally rather than ship their ores to smelters abroad and import these metals in manufactured form.

For our future industrial strength and military power we must start now to increase stockpiles of strategic minerals which we will eventually need before shipments from foreign sources of supply are discontinued, keep what we now have and thus add to our mineral strength.

GROWING MINERAL POTENTIAL OF THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC

It is essential that all Allied Powers awaken to the fact that the metal potential of the Sino-Soviet countries is growing rapidly. A comparison in percentages of world production in 1954 and 1962 shows an increase in the output of iron ore from 25.6 to 35.6; that of steel from 17 to 31 percent; that of coal from 39 to 54 percent; and they have now displaced the United States as the leading producer of iron ore and coal; of manganese ore, 46.9 to 53; chromite, 19.3 to 33.5; nickel, 19.6 to 32.5; tungsten, 38.9 to 53.4; aluminum from 13.4 to 23.9; antimony, 28.8 to 44.8; copper, 12.1 to 16.7; lead, 14.3 to 26.6; mercury, 11.7 to 22.2; platinum, 12.1 to 35.1; tin, 5.4 to 26.5; zinc from 15.9 to 23.5.

These increases are most disturbing as there has been a corresponding decrease in the free world nations in the output of these metals. To counter this unfortunate trend and for survival every effort must be made by the Western Powers, not only to produce and acquire metals for industrial needs but to prevent shipments of metals and metal products to Communist countries.

Although the Sino-Soviets may never

catch up with the expanding industrial power of the Allied Nations, we must nevertheless realize that freedom and prosperity can be maintained only if the Allied Nations as a unit, are alert, and prepared to meet disturbing situations with justified counter-measures and the establishment of definite plans for an assured supply of metals. By such cooperation we may look forward to the time when the Allied Powers will be ready to dig the grave for the burial of Khrushchev and his gangsters who are planning to bury us.

CONCLUSIONS

In their attempt to dominate the world, the Russians together with the Red Chinese are waging a trade war which apparently they are winning. The Western Powers have no well-defined trade policy and some of the powers who prefer today's trade to tomorrow's security, are supplying the Russians with materials they lack—a paradoxical situation which should be corrected before it becomes serious.

United States Must Hold Guantanamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the article from the San Diego Union entitled "United States Must Hold Guantanamo":

UNITED STATES MUST HOLD GUANTANAMO—RED APPEASEMENT HINTED

Is the strategic U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo a pawn on the international chessboard of intrigue?

This suspicion was planted in the American mind last October during the Cuban crisis. There were reports that U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson favored a conciliatory approach in settling the ominous argument.

The administration has denied that appeasement ever was considered as a solution. Developments since then provoke uneasy thoughts as to what actually was involved in the Soviet's agreement to withdraw nuclear missiles from Cuba.

Were there secret giveaways by the United States, possibly related to Guantanamo?

A look at the record is provocative. America's 45 Jupiter intermediate-range missiles have been removed from Turkey. Similar weapons will be removed from Italy and England.

It now has been disclosed that the United States is negotiating with Great Britain for a naval station on Andros Island near Nassau. The reports say that such a base could be used if "U.S. forces ever abandon Guantanamo."

Also, the Defense Department is seeking \$18 million to expand the existing facilities at Roosevelt Roads in Puerto Rico. Rank-and-file citizens of the United States would welcome another naval base at Andros Island and improvements at Roosevelt Roads or whatever steps the Navy deems necessary to bolster our defense posture.

They must be obtained, however, without the sacrifice of Guantanamo as part of any agreement the administration may have worked out with the Communists.

A hint of the administrations' attitude toward Guantanamo is seen in the remarks of Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat of

Ohio, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The United States "does not need Guantanamo," he said. "The base is as obsolete as Fort Bliss near El Paso and other Indian frontier posts we garrisoned as late as 1930."

The naive nature of such statements is appalling. Apart from its intrinsic value as a key naval base in the Caribbean, Guantanamo is the fort that protects the invaluable Windward Passage to the vital Panama Canal. In hostile hands it could become a setback to naval maneuverability and merchant shipping.

House Armed Services Committee members have declared Guantanamo will remain a major U.S. Navy base in the foreseeable future.

But uneasy Americans are entitled to firm assurance from the administration itself that the United States is not going to lose Guantanamo in the veiled intrigue of international politics.

To Curb the Junketeers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as one who has called for the end of profligate spending on congressional junkets since I first came to Congress, I am highly pleased that the essence of many of my own proposals has been embodied in House Joint Resolution 245 which passed the House last week.

It can no longer be said that the House of Representatives has remained oblivious to valid criticism. As the following editorial from the May 9 Washington Star points out, the House did "a fine day's work in its overwhelming vote to put a curb on junketeering." It is now incumbent on the Senate to do likewise.

TO CURB THE JUNKETEERS

The Senate may not follow suit, but the House has done a fine day's work in its overwhelming vote—384 to 2—to put a curb on junketing Members of Congress. The action has been long overdue. It lays down rules that are at once simple and sensible. Under them, Senators and Representatives would no longer be outrageously favored on their travels abroad. They would still enjoy certain advantages, of course, but they would have to give an accounting of them, and that would be an excellent thing.

Thus, if the House bill becomes law, Congressmen on foreign trips will henceforth have the same per diem expense account—from \$12 to \$30—as employees of the executive branch. Further, they will have to report their expenditures in detail and support them with receipts and other documentation whenever they exceed the per diem rate. As a further check the State Department will be required to file an exact accounting of counterpart money (the currencies of the countries visited) handed out to each congressional visitor in Paris, London, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and ever so many other places that our national legislators find delightful on "investigating" tours.

The reform envisioned here seems self-evidently wholesome. But the Senate may balk at it. After all, in the world's greatest deliberative body, there is an historically ingrained reluctance to give up special privileges of any kind. Even so, abuses have their limits, and the American people have good

reason to demand that an end be put to the scandalous junketeering of some of our Congressmen. The House has shown the way for the Senate.

For Law, Order, and Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the following editorial from the May 13 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer is both thoughtful and timely. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR LAW, ORDER, AND JUSTICE

Bomb-throwing bigots in Birmingham—vicious white-supremacy addicts whose acts of violence and hatred advertise their own inferiority—have unleashed such an atrocious and defiant series of assaults upon exponents of reason and moderation that the Federal Government has no honorable choice, in our opinion, but to take effective action, possibly including the use of troops, to maintain law and order and safeguard lives and property.

Widespread eruption of rioting in that beleaguered city Sunday, set off by the bombings of a Negro home and motel, give grim proof that the "Bull" Connors of bias and prejudice in present-day Alabama—whose ignorance and unenlightenment is such that they have no more sense of justice than the whip-wielding slave-drivers of centuries past—are unable or unwilling to preserve the peace and uphold the rights of every individual in accordance with principles of justice and equality.

Voices of fairness and decency in Birmingham, which have pleaded for a solution to problems on the basis of truce terms announced last Friday, cannot be heard above the derisive sneers emitted by public officials who have the duty to maintain law and order but refuse to recognize any sincere effort toward lawful and orderly solutions.

The so-called law-enforcement authorities in Birmingham have contributed heavily to the city's troubles by heaping scorn on all, both white and Negro, who have made an honest attempt to bring racial injustices to an end. Public officials, by deriding peace moves, have fomented violence. They have fanned the flames of intolerance with reckless mouthings of hate.

America is deeply stirred by tragic and disgraceful events in Birmingham, as shown by rallies in Philadelphia and elsewhere. The common goal that should bind together all citizens of good will—of all races, all creeds, all sections of the country—is the goal of equality under the law achieved by means within the law.

It seems to us that the situation in Birmingham has deteriorated to the point where law is dangerously close to giving way to complete anarchy.

The Kennedy administration should ask itself frankly and courageously whether the time has not come to abandon watchful waiting—and to assume responsibilities for law and order and justice which irresponsible officials in the city of Birmingham and the State of Alabama have relinquished by calculated incitement and deliberate default.

Twins Have a Cultural Twin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out on May 6, one of the most significant events in the history of the American theater occurred in the city of Minneapolis with the opening of the Tyrone Guthrie Theater last week. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues two articles from the May 11 Washington Star and the May 12 Washington Post which further mark the significance of that occasion:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1963]

TWINS HAVE A CULTURAL TWIN

(By Leo Sullivan)

MINNEAPOLIS.—Well, Minnesota is really in the big leagues now. The Tyrone Guthrie Theater opened last week as a further symbol of the decentralization of America's theater and as an example of the new exciting, functional playhouses of our time.

Last Tuesday, as baseball fans were warming themselves with the Twins' victory over the New York Yankees and cultural committees prepared for last night's Minneapolis Symphony Ball, the Twin Cities were also experiencing major league theater. And the town was alive to the occasion.

Down Nicollet Avenue traffic moved under banner after banner proclaiming the Big G. Even the most sports-minded Twin Citizen knew that this was not a spring pep rally for the University of Minnesota's Gophers. The Big G stood for Guthrie, a proclamation declared on every piece of mail leaving the State, on posters in the shop windows and on the blazers of the ushers recruited from the University of Minnesota, across the Mississippi in St. Paul.

Hamlet opened the not quite finished theater on Tuesday with a splash swirled by such names as Governor Rolvaag, the Theater Guild's Warren Caro, restaurateur Vincent Sardi, producer Richard Barr and Director Alan Schneider, who hurried back to Washington to finish his production of "The Threepenny Opera," opening this week at Arena Stage. TV's Pernell Roberts, a surprise member of the opening night's bonanza, only added to the Washington contingent that was very much a part of the new theater's success.

George Grizzard was the Hamlet. A North Carolina boy who grew up in Washington and developed his career with the Montgomery Players, the Westmoreland Players, the McLean Theater, Crossroads and, ultimately, Arena Stage, Grizzard was as much Washington's contribution to Minnesota's culture as the Nats were last year to the Twins' baseball standing. His performance as the Prince of Denmark was something both Washington and these Twin Cities could be proud of.

But first and foremost, this was a Tyrone Guthrie production. Just as this tall Britisher has done at Stratford, Ontario, he has placed the stamp of his genius, and that of designer Tanya Moisewitsch, on the theater named for him on Minneapolis' Vineland Place.

Like that theater north of the border, this one is centered around a three-tiered-apron stage which carries its actors out into an auditorium graced with row after row of seats upholstered in reds, greens, blues, and yellows, which bring the theater to life even before the magnificent array of lights goes on.